
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 October 2020

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons), MCD, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/D/20/3250065
198 Station Road, Leigh-on-Sea, SS9 3BS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Nick Levy against the decision of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00063/FULH, dated 16 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 28 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is to replace the existing pitched roof dormers to front with larger flat roof dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to replace the existing pitched roof dormers to front with larger flat roof dormers at 198 Station Road, Leigh-on-Sea, SS9 3BS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/00063/FULH, dated 16 January 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan, Site Plan, Existing and Proposed Plans (Drg No. 1187 Revision No. B).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. Notwithstanding the description of the development given in the application, I have used part of the description from the decision notice and also on the appeal form, which more accurately reflects the proposal under consideration.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached bungalow with accommodation in the roofspace that is served by front and rear dormers. The surrounding area contains a wide range of single storey and two storey properties, both detached

and semi-detached. There is a similar variance in the styles and designs of buildings that are found in the locality. Despite this variety, the setback of properties from the road and the presence of street trees and grass verges on the highway, contribute to the area's pleasant and spacious residential character.

5. The proposed development seeks to replace the existing two hipped roof dormers on the front elevation with two dormers that would have a flat roof. The proposed dormers, although being wider than the existing structures that they would replace, would also have a lower height and be set down from the ridge. In this respect they would accord with guidance set out in the Supplementary Planning Document 1 'Design and Townscape Guide' (SPD1), which states that dormer windows, where appropriate, should appear incidental in the roof slope.
6. The Council have raised concerns in relation to the box design and flat roof form of the proposal, stating that gable roofed front dormers are prevalent in the area. From my site observations however, I was able to see that as well the referenced gable roofed dormers, a number of flat roof dormers were also visible, amongst a general variation that existed at roof level in terms of styles and designs of roofs.
7. Both the Appellant and the Council have made reference to a previously refused application for a single flat roofed dormer on the front of the appeal property. I am not aware of the full circumstances of that previous application, however, this proposal, as well as being set down from the ridge and back from the eaves, as well as in from both sides of the property, would maintain a separation of around 1m between the dormers. This size and siting would ensure that an appreciable section of the front roof slope would remain such that the dormers would not appear unduly bulky or dominant on the roof slope.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not have an unacceptable adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the area. It would not be contrary to Policies KP2 and CP4 of the Council's Core Strategy or Policies DM1 and DM3 of the Development Management Document, which seek, amongst other matters, the creation of a high quality, sustainable urban environment and development that adds to the overall quality of the area. There would also be no conflict with section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which emphasises the need for good design or with SPD1.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above and having taken into account all other matters raised, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

Conditions

10. The Council have suggested a number of conditions. In addition to the standard time condition, the condition requiring matching materials is necessary in the interests of the appearance of the host dwelling and the area. A condition is also needed to secure compliance with the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

F Rafiq INSPECTOR